

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 6, 9-12, 14-16, 19-26, 28-30 and 33-46 were pending in the present application. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 27, 31 and 32 were previously canceled, and claims 12, 15, 16, 24-26, 29, 35, 41, 43 and 44 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 6, 9-11, 14, 19, 21-23, 30, 39, 40, 42, 45 and 46 have been amended and claims 47-53 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 6, 9-11, 14, 19-23, 28, 30, 33, 34, 36-40, 42 and 45-53 are currently pending. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 6, 12, 14, 23, 24, 30, 35, 39, 40, 42, 45 and 46 because of informalities. Applicants have amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 9-12, 14-16, 19-26, 28, 29 and 39-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner also stated that claims 30 and 33-38 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action.

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the various claims that read on the various embodiments discussed by the Examiner, specifically the embodiments shown in Figures 5, 6 and 7.

Independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 3 and 6 read on, *inter alia*, the embodiment of Figure 5.

Independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10, 11 and 14 read on, *inter alia*, the embodiment of Figure 6.

Independent claim 45 and its dependent claims 19-23 read on, *inter alia*, the embodiment of Figure 7.

Independent claim 30 has been amended to read on, *inter alia*, the embodiments of Figures 5, 6 and 7. Its dependent claims 33, 34, 36-38 and 53 read on *inter alia*, various aspects of the different embodiments.

Independent claim 47 has been added to read on, *inter alia*, the embodiments of Figures 5, 6 and 7. Its dependent claims 39, 40, 42, 46 and 48-52 read on *inter alia*, various aspects of the different embodiments.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the art cited by the previous Office Action dated December 14, 2006. For example, independent claim 30 recites “the weight verification unit containing circuitry to generate a comparison result by comparing the computed weighting vector with a received weighting vector received by the signal input; and . . . the interference resistant detection unit containing circuitry to use the estimate of the communications channel, spreading codes, and the weighting vector comparison result for interference resistance of the receiver.” As another example, independent claim 47 recites “the receiver comparing the first and second CLTD weighting vectors; and the receiver suppressing interference based on a result of the comparison of the first and second CLTD weighting vectors.” The cited references, even if combined, do not teach or suggest these claim limitations.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added by this amendment. **If the Examiner should have any questions, please contact Applicants' Attorney, Ron Neerings, at 972-917-5299.** In the event that the enclosed fees are insufficient, please charge any additional fees required to keep this application pending, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

April 25, 2008

Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, TX 75252  
Tel: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Brian A. Carlson/

Brian A. Carlson  
Reg. No. 37,793  
Attorney for Applicants